



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,054	05/08/2007	Bernd Sievernich	3165-150	6080
6449	7590	10/30/2008		
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.			EXAMINER	
1425 K STREET, N.W.				SULLIVAN, DANIELLE D
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			1616	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/594,054	SIEVERNICH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	DANIELLE SULLIVAN	1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                   2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/25/2006.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-15 are pending. New claims 11-15 were added in the preliminary amendment filed 9/25/2006.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kibler et al. (WO 2004/008861).

Kibler et al. discloses a herbicidal composition comprising two herbicides selected from imazapyr, imazaquin, imazamethabenz-methyl, imazamox, imazapic and imazetapyr and a chloroacetamide, acetochlor (page 23, lines 29-37). One can immediately envisage a herbicidal composition comprising imazamox and at least one herbicide selected from chloroacetamides. Thus, claims 1 and 2 are anticipated.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kibler et al. (WO 2004/008861).

### **Applicant's Invention**

Applicant claims a composition as disclosed in above 102(b) rejection. Claims 3 and 4 limit the chloroacetamide to metazachlor. Claim 5 further adds at least one liquid and/or solid carrier.

Applicants claim a method of controlling undesired vegetation, before, during and/or after the emergence of the undesired plants, simultaneously or in succession by applying the composition. Claims 9 and 10 specify the crop treated is brassica napus. Claims 10 and 13 specify the treatment includes at least one compound selected from clomazone, atrazine and cloquintocet. Claim 14 specifies the application rate of the ingredients range from 5 to 2500 g/ha.

### **Determination of the scope and the content of the prior art**

#### **(MPEP 2141.01)**

Kibler et al. teaches the chloroacetamides include metazachlor (page 5, lines 34-40). The compositions as herbicidal and synergistic mixtures applied to eliminate undesired plants from Brassica napus is taught on page 25, lines 20-27. Additional herbicides that may be added include cloquintocet, atrazine and clomazone (page 4, line 15; page 5, line 21; page 24, line 27). The application rates of the ingredients range from 0.2 to 5000 g/ha (page 29, lines 16-21). The herbicidal compositions contain at least one liquid and/or solid carrier and if desired, a surfactant (page 25, line 8-12). The

ingredients may be applied simultaneously or separately pre- or post-emergence (page 28, lines 24-32).

**Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims**

**(MPEP 2141.02)**

Kibler et al. does not provide examples of the composition where the chloroacetamide is metazachlor. However, Kibler et al. teach that metazachlor is a chloroacetamide.

**Finding of *prima facie* obviousness**

**Rationale and Motivation (MPEP 2142-2143)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kibler et al. to further include metazachlor. One would have been motivated to include metazachlor because Kibler et al. teach metazachlor is a chloroacetamide and Kibler et al. teach that chloroacetamides are combined with imazamox.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Danielle Sullivan whose telephone number is (571) 270-3285. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM Mon-Thur EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571) 272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Danielle Sullivan  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1616

/Johann R. Richter/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616